

**Remarks**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested. Claims 1-6, 8-22 and 24-30 remain pending in the application. Claims 14-22 and 24-30 are withdrawn from consideration. The revisions to claims 1 and 14 are supported at page 4, line 1, for example.

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 11-13 have been rejected as anticipated by Robson. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Robson does not disclose the surfactant required by claim 1, a commercial example of which is the "Triton" surfactant. Rather, Robson discloses the use of Tween 20 as a non-ionic surfactant. Applicants are not conceding the relevance of the reference to the remaining features of the rejected claims.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 8-13 have been rejected as anticipated by Britschgi. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Britschgi does not disclose the use of a specific non-ionic surfactant, much less the surfactants required by claim 1. Applicants are not conceding the relevance of the reference to the remaining features of the rejected claims.

Claim 4 has been rejected as obvious over Robson in view of Pierre. Claims 4 and 8 have been rejected as obvious over Britschgi in view of Pierre. In view of the discussion of non-ionic surfactants in the body of the rejection, and the fact that claim 8 was included in the anticipation rejection, Applicants assume that claim 7 was to be included in this rejection rather than claim 8.


Pierre does not remedy the deficiencies of Robson and Britschgi. Even if Pierre recognizes that various non-ionic surfactants such as Tween and Triton surfactants can be used, the reference provides nothing to suggest that one would be more suitable than the other. However, as seen from the accompanying Declaration by Mr. Izumizawa, in the present invention the use of non-ionic detergent selected from polyoxyethyleneglycol p-t-octylphenyl ethers provides results that are surprisingly superior to those achieved with the Tween 20 surfactant. Again, this surfactant is recommended specifically by Robson, and according to the Pierre disclosure would be expected to behave similarly to the surfactant of claim 1. Therefore, any prima facie case of obviousness established by the references has been overcome, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account  
No. 50-3478.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &  
LARSON, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2902  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902  
(612) 455-3800

Dated: August 2, 2006

By:   
Douglas P. Mueller  
Reg. No. 30,300

DPM

**52835**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE